

to have to deny ourselves programs. I support the idea of voluntarism and helped to start the Peace Corps. But when went to start AmeriCorps, I withheld my support because there was a new multi-billion-dollar program that we just could not afford. So, it takes sacrifices, but it also takes a balanced approach with spending freezes, spending cuts, loophole closings, withholding of new programs, and a revenue increases.

The reason we are in this particular dilemma is that nobody in public office can use the expression "tax increase" and get by with it. They describe it as some kind of lunatic fringe. The media, which is charged with the responsibility of exposing the truth and bringing us in public office to task, has joined the conspiracy. They are one of the major culprits—by constantly quoting inaccurate deficit numbers and to budget that are balanced when they should know otherwise.

Take this particular budget we will soon be discussing. I ask you to refer to Mr. KASICH, the chairman of the House Budget Committee, concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996. Mr. KASICH in the conference report on page 3, and I read under the entitlement subsection 4, "deficits," fiscal year 2002, a deficit of \$108.4 billion. So, please, spare me from all this balanced budget talk. The media, the politicians, the White House, both parties and everybody else—let us start talking reality. The Republican plan that claims to balance budgets has no idea of being balanced. Indeed, Chairman KASICH himself in his conference report projects a deficit of \$108.4 billion.

Let me focus for a moment on this tax-cut nonsense that we have to listen to in our debate. We talk about whether the cut is for the middle class, or the rich, or whether you are going to get credit, or we get credit or how much, or whatever it is, but no one really wants to come and say that the tax cut is going to lose revenues. That is why I have inserted this article that appeared yesterday in the Wall Street Journal, entitled "GOP Tax Cuts Will Add \$93 billion to the United States Debt."

Going just to the October 23 issue of the New Republic, let me quote:

Neocornman in the late 1970's and early 1980's, Irving Crystal, editor of the Public Interest, helped lend intellectual credibility to the supply side theory that cutting taxes would not increase the deficit. Crystal opened the public interests to supplysiders and introduced Jack Kemp, author of the Kemp-Roth tax bill that initiated the era of disastrous deficits, to supply side guru Jude Wannisky. In the 30th anniversary of the Public Interest, Crystal now confesses that he and his allies never really understood economics. They were merely after a something-for-nothing gimmick that could help elect Republicans.

Now he quotes from that particular statement in Public Interest, and I quote it.

Among the core social scientists around the Public Interest there were no econo-

mists. They came later as we matured. This explains my own rather cavalier attitude toward the budget deficit and other monetary or fiscal problems. The task, as I saw it, was to create a Republican majority so political effectiveness was the priority, not the accounting deficiencies of Government.

I quote just a couple other sentences from that particular article:

Now he tells us. Thanks anyway, Irving, for the confession of complete political cynicism. The accounting deficiencies of Government, by the way, at last count add up to \$4.9 trillion.

If you look at the historical budget tables that I have distributed, I started back when we balanced the budget. This Senator has voted for a balanced budget. Yes, I am an endangered species—one of a very few left around here. But in 1968–1969, under President Lyndon Baines Johnson, you can see that the unified budget was in surplus by \$3.2 billion, or the real budget surplus was \$2.9 billion.

These are CBO figures, by the way. And I have researched them all the way back to the 1940's. But I wanted to have these figures on one piece of paper showing the Government budget in outlays, the trust funds and the unified deficit—which together make up for the real deficit—the gross Federal debt, and the gross interest costs.

I know people get bored listening to figures, but they better listen to this because they are going to have to live with these figures. You cannot avoid them. You cannot avoid death. You cannot avoid taxes. And you cannot avoid the interest costs on the national debt.

Right here in 1996, the present fiscal year, you can see that the Congressional Budget Office has projected an interest cost on the national debt of \$348 billion. That is \$1 billion a day. There are only 365 days in a year. So we have got automatic spending—or, rather, spending on automatic pilot of \$1 billion a day.

This cancer has got to be excised. It cannot be defrauded. It cannot be finessed.

The present budget for 1996 increases spending. You will find at the bottom of the page not only the Kasich conference report which shows a \$108 billion deficit in the year 2002—where they say on the face of the document itself there is a deficit and not a balanced budget—but also the 1996 budget outlay of \$1.5756 trillion. Then look just below that, of course, is 1995, last year's, \$1.518 trillion. So as you go from 1995 to 1996, you have increased spending.

Here is the best of the best that have come to town, the 74 freshmen on the House side that are controlling the agenda and are said to be beyond the control of the distinguished Speaker. And instead of cutting spending, they have increased spending \$57.6 billion. That envisions, of course, abolishing the Department of Commerce, the Office of Technology and Assessment, the Advanced Technology Program, cutting education, cutting housing, cut-

ting all of these other things, and Government outlays still increase.

Mr. President, here we have also listed the CBO baseline assuming passage of legislation to enact the budget resolution. The outlays for the year 2002 are \$1.876 trillion, and the revenues of \$1.883 trillion. So that is close enough. We call that a balanced budget. But now look down below, how they get to that particular outlay figure. They do that by extending the freeze on discretionary spending through the year 2002.

This fact is assumed rather than stated in the document prepared by the Republican Budget Committee staff entitled, "Conference Agreement Compared to Baseline." It is used by Senator DOMENICI, our distinguished chairman and shows \$1.876 trillion in outlays. The way you get it down to those outlays is starting from a figure at the top of the sheet called "Current Law Deficit."

Well, if you have not been in the budget game, you might say, "Wait a minute. What in the world is a current law deficit?" Translated into reality, it says, "Assume that the discretionary caps do not expire in 1998 and continue them for the year 1999, the year 2000, the year 2001, and the year 2002." They pick up \$91 billion—by extending the discretionary freeze through 2002.

Then they say, "the necessary spending cuts of total deficit reduction" on the work sheet. This is using the chairman of the Republican Budget Committee's own document. I am not playing games with figures. I want to assume everything they say is true and show you they still do not have a cause of action.

If we assume everything they say is true, they still do not have a balanced budget. Why? Because they say you have got to cut in the year 2002 a reduction of \$235 billion in addition to the freeze of \$91 billion. And then comparing apples to apples, we must subtract from that \$1.876 trillion, the \$109 billion surplus in the Social Security trust fund. So the total reduction needed in the year 2002, is a \$435 billion reduction.

Now, Mr. President, look at what we are doing here. In the year 1996 we are trying to get a \$10 billion reduction in non-defense spending—\$10 billion. And, at the present time, we cannot get it. That is why we have not passed all of the appropriations bill. Our colleagues on the Republican side, as well as the colleagues on the Democratic side, are struggling to find \$10 billion in discretionary cuts, much less \$435 billion.

In the debate on the State, Justice, Commerce Appropriations bill, I used the expression that if the present budget plan balanced by the year 2002, I would jump off the Capitol dome. The chairman of the Budget Committee, my colleague, Senator DOMENICI, said, "Well, you better take hang gliding lessons." I said, "I'm not going to take them from you because I know I will crash, just like this budget."

I can tell you here and now, if we cannot cut \$10 billion in this struggle